

151. The pogo-ski of claim 146, wherein said translational motion linking means includes a hydraulic linking tube with left and right connections to the left foot support and right foot support respectively.
152. The pogo-ski of claim 146, wherein said translational motion linking means includes a pneumatic linking tube with left and right connections to the left foot support and right foot support respectively.

**REMARKS:**

A replacement sheet for Fig. 24A has been provided, as required by Examiner's Action's remarks on Drawings. The slight modifications to this Figure add no new material not supported by the original specification and drawings, e.g., from Fig.s 4 and 13B.

Regarding the 35 USC 112 rejections, changes have been made in the Amendment A as specified herein, to address the specific indefiniteness issues raised by the Examiner.

Regarding the 35 USC 102 and 35 USC 103 rejections, applicant has attempted to carefully craft revised independent claims 82, 83 and 84 which more clearly specify the invention's inventive features which make these revised claims not anticipated and not obvious from the references cited by the Examiner. Remaining dependent claims 85 through 152 are each dependent directly or indirectly on the revised independent claims 82, 83 and 84, and so are also not believed to be anticipated or obvious from the cited references. These dependent claims add additional novel features and thus are submitted to be, a-fortiori, patentable. Note that applicant respectfully submits

that the revised independent claims 82, 83 and 84 are generic and should be allowed, and thus the restriction specified by the Examiner to restrict claims to one species should generic claim(s) not be allowed, should be now withdrawn.

Regarding the reference to Winchell (US 4087106), it would not be obvious from Winchell to have a pogo-ski with a “single ski” as cited in revised claim 82, or a “a ski providing a laterally substantially contiguously located sliding means below a user” as cited in revised claim 83, or a “single snowboard” as cited in revised claim 84. Winchell clearly specifies a 3-ski riding device, which is fundamentally different and unrelated to the present 1-ski pogo-ski, in terms of the load path from the user to the sliding surface and in terms of how the user balances and controls the device and in terms of kinematics and dynamics of the user-device system.

Regarding the reference to Rappaport (US 6739606), it would not be obvious from Rappaport or Rappaport in conjunction with Winchell to have a pogo-ski with a “single ski” as cited in revised claim 82, or a “a ski providing a laterally substantially contiguously located sliding means below a user” as cited in revised claim 83, or a “single snowboard” as cited in revised claim 84. Rappaport clearly specifies a 3-ski or 3-float riding device, which is fundamentally different and unrelated to the present 1-ski pogo-ski, in terms of the load path from the user to the sliding surface and in terms of how the user balances and controls the device and in terms of kinematics and dynamics of the user-device system.

Regarding the reference to Rygiel (US 4773659), it would not be obvious from Rygiel to have a pogo-ski with a “single ski” as cited in revised claim 82, or a “a ski providing a laterally substantially contiguously located sliding means below a user” as cited in revised claim 83, or a

“single snowboard” as cited in revised claim 84. Rygiel clearly specifies a 2-ski scooter-type of riding device with tandem foot placement, which is fundamentally different and unrelated to the present 1-ski pogo-ski, in terms of the load path from the user to the sliding surface and in terms of how the user balances and controls the device and in terms of kinematics and dynamics of the user-device system. Rygiel also does not suggest or even hint in any way to the “vertical movement” (claim 82) or “variable left spacing” & “variable right spacing” (claim 83) or “variable left height” & “variable right height” which are important elements of the present pogo-ski invention.

Regarding the reference to Barton (US 3338589), it would not be obvious from Barton to have a pogo-ski with a “single ski” as cited in revised claim 82, or a “a ski providing a laterally substantially contiguously located sliding means below a user” as cited in revised claim 83, or a “single snowboard” as cited in revised claim 84. Barton clearly specifies a 2-side-by-side-ski sled-type of riding device for buttock-contacting riding use, which is fundamentally different and unrelated to the present 1-ski pogo-ski for use by a standing rider, in terms of the load path from the user to the sliding surface and in terms of how the user balances and controls the device and in terms of kinematics and dynamics of the user-device system.

Regarding the reference to Williams (US 4047732), it would not be obvious from Williams to have a pogo-ski with a “single ski” as cited in revised claim 82, or a “a ski providing a laterally substantially contiguously located sliding means below a user” as cited in revised claim 83, or a “single snowboard” as cited in revised claim 84. Williams clearly specifies a 3-wheel riding device, which is fundamentally different and unrelated to the present 1-ski pogo-ski, in terms of the load path from the user to the ground surface and in terms of how the user balances and controls the device and in terms of kinematics and dynamics of the user-device system.

Regarding the reference to Brown (US 2593974), it would not be obvious from Brown to have a pogo-ski with a “single ski” as cited in revised claim 82, or a “a ski providing a laterally substantially contiguously located sliding means below a user” as cited in revised claim 83, or a “single snowboard” as cited in revised claim 84. Brown clearly specifies a 2-side-by-side-ski “ski-sled”, which is fundamentally different and unrelated to the present 1-ski pogo-ski, in terms of the load path from the user to the sliding surface and in terms of how the user balances and controls the device and in terms of kinematics and dynamics of the user-device system. Brown also does not suggest or even hint in any way to the “vertical movement” (claim 82) or “variable left spacing” & “variable right spacing” (claim 83) or “variable left height” & “variable right height” which are important elements of the present pogo-ski invention.

Regarding the references to Philippar (US 2392098) and Parkinson (US 4643444), they do not provide any inventive material that would make obvious the present pogo-ski as claimed in revised independent claims 82, 83 and 84 or claims dependent thereon.

Regarding the reference to Hunter (US 5096217), Hunter does not suggest or even hint in any way at a post or handlebars for his monoski, and also does not suggest or even hint in any way to the “vertical movement” (claim 82) or “variable left spacing” & “variable right spacing” (claim 83) or “variable left height” & “variable right height” which are important elements of the present pogo-ski invention.

Regarding the reference to Geary (US 6783134), it would not be obvious from Geary to have a pogo-ski with a “single ski” as cited in revised claim 82, or a “a ski providing a laterally

substantially contiguously located sliding means below a user” as cited in revised claim 83, or a “single snowboard” as cited in revised claim 84. Geary clearly specifies a 2-ski bicycle-type of device with a buttocks-interfacing seat, which is fundamentally different and unrelated to the present 1-ski pogo-ski, in terms of the load path from the user to the sliding surface and in terms of how the user balances and controls the device and in terms of kinematics and dynamics of the user-device system. Geary also does not suggest or even hint in any way to the “vertical movement” (claim 82) or “variable left spacing” & “variable right spacing” (claim 83) or “variable left height” & “variable right height” regarding the spatial relationship between a ski and foot interface elements, which are important features of the present pogo-ski invention.

Regarding the reference to Horibata (US 5127672) for a “Hopping Roller Skate or Ski”, it would not be obvious from Horibata to have a pogo-ski with a “single ski” as cited in revised claim 82, or a “a ski providing a laterally substantially contiguously located sliding means below a user” as cited in revised claim 83, or a “single snowboard” as cited in revised claim 84. Horibata clearly specifies a hopping skate with separate skates on each foot, with separate ground interfaces, and specifies “stability for a wearer on the coil springs is maintained with a pair of sticks”, which is fundamentally different and unrelated to the present 1-ski pogo-ski with a post and handhold means, in terms of the load path from the user to the sliding surface and in terms of how the user balances and controls the device and in terms of kinematics and dynamics of the user-device system.

Regarding the reference to Sullivan (US 6929267), Sullivan does not suggest or even hint in any way to the “vertical movement” (claim 82) or “variable left spacing” & “variable right spacing” (claim 83) or “variable left height” & “variable right height” regarding the spatial relationship between a ski and foot interface elements, which are important features of the present pogo-ski

invention, and these features would not be obvious in any way from Sullivan. Sullivan's primary inventive thrust relates to snowboard warping for control.

Regarding the reference to Monreal (US 4678445) for a "Water and snow wishbone shaped sled for one or two", Monreal does not suggest or even hint in any way at a post or handlebars for his sled, and Monreal does not suggest or even hint in any way to the "vertical movement" (claim 82) or "variable left spacing" & "variable right spacing" (claim 83) or "variable left height" & "variable right height" regarding the spatial relationship between a ski and foot interface elements, which are important features of the present pogo-ski invention.

Regarding the reference to Waller (US 1559390) for an "Aquaplane", it would not be obvious from Waller to have a pogo-ski with a "single ski" as cited in revised claim 82, or a "a ski providing a laterally substantially contiguously located sliding means below a user" as cited in revised claim 83, or a "single snowboard" as cited in revised claim 84. Waller clearly specifies a 2-water-ski riding device, which is fundamentally different and unrelated to the present 1-ski pogo-ski, in terms of the load path from the user to the sliding surface and in terms of how the user balances and controls the device and in terms of kinematics and dynamics of the user-device system. Waller also does not suggest or even hint in any way at a post or handlebars for his aquaplane; and does not suggest or even hint in any way to the "vertical movement" (claim 82) or "variable left spacing" & "variable right spacing" (claim 83) or "variable left height" & "variable right height" regarding the spatial relationship between a ski and foot interface elements, which are important features of the present pogo-ski invention.

While the cited references do cite selected elements of the novel features of the present pogo-ski invention, applicant respectfully submits that the combination of these multiple unrelated inventions to synthesize a pogo-ski as described and claimed in the attached revised claims, would certainly not be obvious to practitioners of the art.

**Request for Constructive Assistance:**

The undersigned has made a diligent effort to amend the claims of this application so that they define novel structure which is submitted to be unanticipated and unobvious from the prior art, for reasons explained in the remarks above. If, for any reason, the claims of this application are not believed to be in full condition for allowance, the private inventor applicant respectfully requests the constructive assistance and suggestions of the Examiner in drafting one or more acceptable independent claims (on which the dependant claims may also depend) pursuant to MPEP 707.07(j) or in making constructive suggestions pursuant to MPEP 706.03(d) in order that this application can be placed in allowable condition as soon as possible and without the need for further proceedings.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Dr. Mithra M.K.V. Sankrithi

17602 Bothell Way N.E.

Lake Forest Park, WA 98155

Tel. (206) 417-8936

Fax (206) 367-1337

Email [sankrithi@comcast.net](mailto:sankrithi@comcast.net)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class or Priority Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on April 16, 2006.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Mithra Sankrithi", written in dark ink.

---

Mithra M.K.V. Sankrithi, Applicant